

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/802,015	KHORRAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dean O. Takaoka	2817	

All Participants:

(1) Dean O. Takaoka.

(2) Bruce E. Stuckman.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8 August 2006
Time: 7:00pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

102

Claims discussed:

1,6

Prior art documents discussed:


Rofougaran

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was the position of the Examiner that connected and coupled did not further limit the claims and requested Applicant to further distinguish Claims 1 and 6 where Applicant's capacitors C2 and C3 were directly connected to ground as opposed to indirect connections or couplings of C1 and C2 shown by Rofougaran. It was agreed to further distinguish the claims by adding the word "directly" to claims 1 and 6 by Examiner's amendment in order to place the claims in condition for allowance..